

## REMARKS

Please cancel Claim 53 without prejudice. Claims 1-6, 12-13, 16-20, 24-28, 33-36, 39, 41-43 and 46-50 are pending. Claims 1, 26 and 48 are amended herein. No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments.

### 112, First Paragraph, Rejections

According to the instant Office Action, Claims 1-6, 12-13, 16-20, 24-28, 33-36, 39, 41-43 and 46-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. In particular, the Office Action states that it cannot be ascertained from the specification what “font array” means.

Applicant respectfully submits that the term “font array” is a term of the art, known to those of ordinary skill in the art. Regardless, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant specification adequately describes the meaning of “font array.”

According to the specification, a font array can be described as an array or data structure that holds font information (e.g., size width and size height information) for each of a number of different characters. The font information is indexed so that font information can be accessed for a particular character. Applicant respectfully submits that care must be taken not to confuse the terms “font” and “character.” For example, characters include letters or numbers, and a font (or font information) defines qualities such as the size of the characters.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-6, 12-13, 16-20, 24-28, 33-36, 39, 41-43 and 46-47 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and respectfully requests that the rejection of those claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

112, Second Paragraph, Rejections

Claims 1-6, 12-13, 16-20, 24-28, 33-36, 39, 41-43 and 46-47

According to the instant Office Action, Claims 1-6, 12-13, 16-20, 24-28, 33-36, 39, 41-43 and 46-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In particular, the Office Action states that it cannot be ascertained from the specification what “font array” means.

As presented above, Applicant respectfully submits that the term “font array” is a term of the art, known to those of ordinary skill in the art. Regardless, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant specification adequately describes the meaning of “font array,” as presented above.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-6, 12-13, 16-20, 24-28, 33-36, 39, 41-43 and 46-47 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and respectfully requests that the rejection of those claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claims 48-50

According to the instant Office Action, Claims 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Independent Claim 48 is amended herein to address the issues raised in the Office Action, and as such Applicant respectfully submits that the basis for rejecting Claim 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is traversed. By virtue of the dependence of Claims 49-50 on Claim 48, Applicant respectfully submits that the basis

for rejecting Claims 49-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is also traversed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 48-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

### 103 Rejections

The instant Office Action states that Claims 1-6, 12-13, 16-20, 24-28, 33-36, 39, 41-43 and 46-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lobodzinski et al. ("Lobodzinski;" U.S. Patent No. 5,734,873) in view of Larson (U.S. Patent No. 5,999,199). The Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that the present invention as recited in Claims 1-6, 12-13, 16-20, 24-28, 33-36, 39, 41-43 and 46-50 is not anticipated or shown by Lobodzinski and Larson, alone or in combination.

Independent Claims 1, 26 and 48 each recite particular functions performed by a graphics controller in accordance with embodiments of the present invention. As a result of the graphics controller performing these functions, the burden on the central processing unit is reduced.

Lobodzinski describes a driver executed by the central processing unit 22. Importantly, from the discussion in Lobodzinski, it is apparent that the driver is not a part of the display controller 30.

Larson describes a host processor 50 that provides data and control signals to a graphics hardware subsystem. However, Larson does not appear to describe that the data and control signals are limited to those recited in the claims of the present application.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Lobodzinski nor Larson show or suggest a system or method “wherein for the graphics controller to render the character, the central processing unit is required to transfer to the graphics controller only an address for the data structure, an index value for locating the character in the data structure, an x-value indicating a horizontal position for the character and a y-value indicating a vertical position for the character, wherein the graphics controller locates the data structure using the address and locates the character using the index value” as recited in independent Claim 48 and as similarly recited in independent Claims 1 and 26.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Lobodzinski and Larson, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1, 26 and 48. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the basis for rejecting Claims 1, 26 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed, and that Claims 1, 26 and 48 are in condition for allowance. As such, Applicant respectfully submits the basis for rejecting Claims 2-6, 12-13, 16-20, 24-25, 27-28, 33-36, 39, 41-43, 46-47 and 49-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is also traversed, as Claims 2-6, 12-13, 16-20, 24-25, 27-28, 33-36, 39, 41-43, 46-47 and 49-50 are dependent on either Claim 1, 26 or 48 and recite additional limitations.

#### Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1-6, 12-13, 16-20, 24-28, 33-36, 39, 41-43 and 46-50 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicant respectfully solicits allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 4/10/06



William A. Zarbis  
Reg. No. 46,120

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
(408) 938-9060